TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

09-51

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
EMERGENCY RESPONSE)
INTEROPERABILITY CENTER)
PUBLIC FORUM)

Pages: 1 through 69

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: March 2, 2010

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
EMERGENCY RESPONSE   )
INTEROPERABILITY CENTER   )
PUBLIC FORUM   )

                          Commission Meeting Room
                          FCC Building
                          445 12th Street, S.W.
                          Washington, D.C.

                          Tuesday,
                          March 2, 2010

     The parties met, pursuant to notice, at

2:00 p.m.

     BEFORE: JENNIFER MANNER, Deputy Chief, Public
Safety and Homeland Security Bureau

     APPEARANCES:

     JAMES ARDEN BARNETT, Jr., Rear Admiral (Ret.),
     Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security
     Bureau
     CHRIS ESSID, Director, Office of Emergency
     Communications,
     DHS Jeffery Goldthorp, Chief, Communications
     Systems Analysis Division, PSHSB
     DERECK ORR, Program Manager for Public Safety
     Communications, Office of Law Enforcement
     Standards, NIST
     ZIAD SLEEM, Associate Division Chief, WTB
     Spectrum and Competition Policy Division

                Heritage Reporting Corporation
                     (202) 628-4888

APPEARANCES (CONT'D)

Registered Speakers:

HARLIN MCEWIN, PSST/IACP
BILL CARROW, APCO
CYNTHIA COLE, Cynergyze Consulting
JONATHAN DELONG, Zos Communications
STEPHEN VERBIL, Emergency Telecommunications
Manager, CT. DPS
GIL ARMENDARIZ, Chairman, Sy Tech Corp
JOHN DOHERTY, VP Engineering, GEOCommand
PRUDENCE PARKS, Utilities Telecom Council
STEVE O'CONOR, NENA (First VP)
KEVIN FOOTE, Director, National Emergency
Internet Deflection System
STACEY BLACK, AT&T

```
 1              P R O C E E D I N G S

 2                                        (2:00 p.m.)

 3              MR. BARNETT:  Good afternoon.  My name is

 4     Jamie Barnett, I'm the Chief of the Public Safety and

 5     Homeland Security Bureau here at the FCC, and we

 6     really appreciate your presence here to talk today

 7     about the creation and the functions of the Emergency

 8     Response Interoperability Center, or ERIC.  The fact

 9     that the acronym is ERIC is purely coincidental that

10     Jennifer Manner's husband's name is Eric, it was not

11     named after him.

12              But we are excited about the possibilities

13     of what this center can do.  Now, I'd like take this

14     opportunity to thank our partners in this endeavor,

15     and truly it has been a partnership in coming up with

16     the concept, particularly the Department of Homeland

17     Security Office of Emergency Communications, NIST, and

18     the Department of Justice.  We're excited about these

19     partnerships and the collaborations developed among

20     our agencies, and we're looking forward to working

21     together on these challenging and crucial public

22     safety issues.

23              Now, today's forum is important because even

24     though there is a consensus on the overarching ERIC

25     concept there are still many details to be worked out.
```

1   Your input today and in the future, quite frankly,

2   will help us especially in developing the architecture

3   of ERIC, will help us identify the issues that need to

4   be resolved, gaps that need to be filled, and

5   obstacles that we need to overcome.

6   Our vision for ERIC is that it will become

7   part of the nationwide public safety communications

8   structure. We're not looking for it to replace any

9   agency or entity that currently is in place, we're

10   simply looking to assist an already vibrant community

11   that's working day in and day out to improve public

12   safety communications.   ERIC will enhance efforts to

13   move public safety communications forward as we strive

14   to implement broadband technologies and innovations.

15   In addition, ERIC will facilitate a focused

16   approach as we work towards creating and implementing

17   a nationwide wireless public safety broadband network.

18   It will strive to develop common technical standards

19   for interoperability on the public safety broadband

20   network from the start and to update these standards

21   periodically as broadband technologies evolve. It is

22   important that we get this network right from day one,

23   and I've emphasized over and over again we really get

24   one shot at this, one at-bat, one swing to make sure

25   that we get it right. Having an entity totally focus

1   on this will help us achieve that goal.

2   Today we hope to touch on the following

3   topics. Technical requirements for public safety

4   broadband networks to ensure interoperability, roaming

5   for frameworks for public safety users, and priority

6   access for public safety users. This of course isn't

7   an all inclusive list, but these are important topics

8   which we want to stay focused on as much as possible

9   today. I realize there are other things we could be

10   talking about.

11   Again, thank you for taking the time to be

12   with us today in person. With those of you who are on

13   the web, we appreciate your interest in improving

14   communications for our nation's first responders. The

15   importance of reliable, interoperable, ubiquitous

16   communication for public safety cannot be overstated.

17   Now I'd like to turn it over, the podium, to Chris

18   Essid, the Director of DHS's Office of Emergency

19   Communications, for his comments. And once again,

20   Chris, thank you for your strong partnership with us.

21   MR. ESSID: Good afternoon, Jamie, and

22   thanks for having me here. I've been the Director of

23   the Office of Emergency Communications within the

24   Department of Homeland Security for the last two

25   years. Before this job I served as Virginia's

1   Commonwealth Interoperability Coordinator in the

2   Governor's Office, and what seems like a lifetime ago

3   I was in the U.S. Army as a Military Police Officer.

4   So I've experienced the issue we're talking about

5   today at the state level as a user, and now as a

6   Federal manager, so, you know, a wide variety of

7   touches on this subject.

8   The U.S. has pushed hard to fully resolve

9   the problems that keep responders from being able to

10   communicate with whom they need to when they need to.

11   Per our legislative mandate, the Department of

12   Homeland Security has driven the national effort to

13   improve emergency communications for our public safety

14   and first responders, enhancing operability,

15   interoperability , and continuity of mission critical

16   voice, video, and data communications for the people

17   that we depend upon every day to save lives.

18   We have aggressively moved forward to

19   integrate broadband and next generation technologies

20   into the National Emergency Communications Plan, we

21   have increased technical assistance that directly

22   targets state and regional goals, we have created

23   senior level coordinating bodies such as the Safecom

24   Executive Committee and Emergency Response Council,

25   and most recently the Emergency Communications

1   Preparedness Center.

2   These groups have already moved forward to

3   remove key interoperability barriers, and we are

4   working to coordinate all facets of emergency

5   communications. Public safety communications

6   interoperability is a complicated issue that has

7   changed over time as technology and cultural shifts

8   enable greater capabilities. One thing I've

9   experienced first hand is that interoperability in

10   emergency communications, the problem is 90 percent

11   coordination, 10 percent technology.

12   Broadband is one such tool that has added a

13   whole new dimension to communications. It can greatly

14   enhance the abilities of emergency responders to

15   accomplish their missions. However, our focus on

16   training and exercises, standard operating procedures,

17   and proper governance, all these activities we call

18   the coordination activities, is just as relevant for

19   the new technologies as it is to existing LMR

20   technologies, as it will be for future technologies

21   that haven't even been invented yet.

22   The public safety community has been using

23   wireless broadband applications for some time, working

24   to understand how these data tools complement mission

25   critical voice capabilities. Some of you in this room

1   have been working on the development of a public

2   safety broadband network for over a decade, and it's

3   our responsibility to ensure that we deploy this

4   smartly. The Emergency Response Interoperability

5   Center, ERIC is one way to help us do this in a

6   coordinated way.

7   Already DHS has partnered with the FCC to

8   begin the process of establishing ERIC to adopt and

9   enforce standards for a public safety broadband

10   network. To demonstrate our commitment we are already

11   strengthening our governance structures, advisory

12   groups, and grants and technical assistance mechanisms

13   that will ensure the national network meets public

14   safety's needs. We look forward to working closely

15   with the public safety community and the FCC to make

16   this network a reality. Thank you. And next I would

17   like to introduce Jeff Goldthorp of the FCC.

18   MR. GOLDTHORP: Thank you Chris. Jamie was

19   saying I think that the FCC is as committed as we've

20   ever been to the vision of a nationwide public safety

21   network. Times change and our methods change. Let's

22   talk for a minute about the facts on the ground today,

23   and then we'll get into ERIC and what we have in mind

24   for ERIC, how we think ERIC can help bring about this

25   network that we aspire to.

1   First of all, we're seeing around us today

2   the deployment with vigor of a new generation of

3   wireless technology, 4G technologies, in the

4   commercial realm, and the 700 MHZ band is happening as

5   we speak today. And the deployment of these

6   technologies give public safety an opportunity to

7   benefit from the features and the functions that come

8   with them as it relates to broadband. Also gives

9   public safety the benefit of a whole different cost

10   platform than what public safety has been accustomed

11   to. So there are benefits, rich benefits that come

12   with the deployment and the emergence of a new

13   generation of commercial wireless technology.

14   The second item is that as we look around us

15   now, a number of public safety jurisdictions are very

16   interested in moving forward now, today, in deployment

17   of broadband public safety networks in their

18   jurisdictions, that's a fact. So the question we have

19   to ask ourselves is, is it possible for us to create a

20   seamless, interoperable, broadband nationwide network

21   -- that is, a network of networks, not a homogeneous

22   network, the one that we had imagined a few years ago,

23   but a network of networks -- is that possible?

24   Absolutely it's possible, it's been done

25   before, and it can be done again. It may not have

1   been done in public safety before, I'm not thinking

2   about public safety in the instance I had in my mind

3   right now, but it has been done and it can be done,

4   there's no technical reason why it can't be. So we

5   have to decide, what do we need to do to help make

6   that happen? And that's where ERIC fits in.

7   There is a need for an entity to try and

8   harmonize the actions of public safety entities as

9   they go forward in this new quest. Where those

10   actions need to be harmonized to enable

11   interoperability, that's the role of ERIC. ERIC's

12   functions will tend to be technical in nature, as I'll

13   describe in a moment, operational in nature. But the

14   general idea is to try and harmonize the actions of

15   actors that wouldn't necessarily otherwise be

16   harmonized where that needs to happen.

17   The Emergency Response Interoperability

18   Center will be formed at the FCC to do two things.

19   First of all to adopt technical and operational

20   framework to enable interoperability for public safety

21   broadband networks, and second of all to apply and

22   enforce those requirements by way of whether it be FCC

23   rules or whether it be license and lease requirements

24   or whether it be grant conditions. So there's those

25   two aspects to what we see ERIC and the FCC doing to

1   try and make this happen, to try and bring this all

2   together.

3   ERIC is going to be working collaboratively

4   with our Federal partners and with the public safety

5   advisory committee that we'll be setting up with the

6   folks that are sitting here, with the OEC at DHS on

7   matters such as outreach and best practice

8   development, with NIST on the identification,

9   development, and participation and standards bodies

10   and verification, testing and validation. We're also

11   forming a advisory committee with public safety to

12   advise us on matters that are knowledgeable to

13   practitioners in that space. So we're not doing this

14   alone, we're doing this in partnership with public

15   safety and with our Federal partners.

16   We can see ERIC getting into a number of

17   specific areas right off the bat. Some of them Jamie

18   mentioned, but let me just touch on them now. I'm

19   sure they'll come up later and we can spend a little

20   bit more time. One that obvious one is, when you've

21   got a first responder that is responding to a scene of

22   an event in a different jurisdiction, needs to

23   communicate not only with responders on the scene but

24   even to have access to services and applications back

25   at home.

1   So there's a need for roaming and a need for

2   first responders to be able to move about between

3   jurisdictions in a way that we're not as accustomed to

4   today. So roaming, and that's a technical issue as

5   well as an operational issue. Technical requirements

6   are needed and operational requirements are needed.

7   There needs to be interconnectivity between the

8   networks of the different public safety jurisdictions

9   that are being set up. Those networks need to be able

10   to talk to each other, connect to each other,

11   communicate with each other. And that is sort of a

12   feature or a function that underlies roaming, you

13   can't have roaming if networks aren't interconnected.

14   So that's necessary, and maybe requirements for that.

15   Priority access is another that Jamie

16   mentioned. We envision a world where public safety

17   will have access not only to its own spectrum in the

18   band and the 700 MHZ band, but to possibly other

19   commercial carrier spectrum in that band, and that

20   would require some requirements for priority access --

21   how does public safety access, how do first responders

22   access those bands, and what are the technical

23   requirements for doing that.

24   And then the final one that I'll mention

25   today, a category of requirements are security

1   requirements. So, for example, authentication, when

2   you enter a new or go to another jurisdiction, how do

3   you join that network? How does the network know that

4   you are who you say you are? What's the identity

5   management protocol to do that? And that's the

6   authentication problem that needs to be solved for

7   this problem.

8   And also encryption, and that'll be the last

9   one that I'll mention today. For security purposes

10   there needs to be some common standard for encryption.

11   If everybody's encrypting their communications

12   differently then nobody except the folks that are

13   local will be able to unencrypt them and use them. So

14   that's just sort of a snapshot of the things that we

15   see ERIC doing.

16   We see this stuff, or these requirements,

17   rolling out over the months to come, and we're looking

18   forward to working with the folks here and with all of

19   you to make this happen. I'm eager to move forward

20   with this as I'm sure all of you are as well, and I

21   thank you for your time today. I'll turn it over now

22   to Dereck Orr of NIST.

23   MR. ORR: Thanks, Jeff. Real quickly, my

24   name is Dereck Orr, I'm the Program Manager of Public

25   Safety Communications Systems at the National

1   Institute of Standards and Technology. I am also the

2   Program Manager for the Public Safety Communications

3   Research Program out in Boulder, Colorado, where we

4   run a joint program between NIST, NIST's Office of Law

5   Enforcement Standards, and NTIA's Institute for

6   Telecommunications Sciences. And what I'm here to

7   talk about today -- are these mics going in and out?

8   What I'm here to talk about today is, one,

9   for people who aren't familiar with us, because we are

10   kind of out in the hinterlands out in Boulder, we are

11   focused on public safety requirements, standards, and

12   helping public safety understand how technologies

13   address their specific public safety needs. That's

14   what we've done for over a decade now, and that's our

15   particular focus. And so the evolving issue of

16   broadband for public safety is a perfect issue for us

17   and one we're very interested in, and we're been

18   working along with our public safety partners for a

19   while now in figuring out how best we could help

20   public safety prepare for this new wave of technology,

21   which is the broadband network.

22   And so what we've determined is, as public

23   safety has really kind of congealed around the idea of

24   LTE as a standard that they want to embrace for

25   broadband, LTE is a bleeding edge technology, I

1   wouldn't even say it's a cutting edge technology, it's

2   a bleeding edge technology that even from a commercial

3   perspective not many people have any familiarity with

4   or knowledge of. And so there are some pilots and

5   demonstrations occurring around the world right now

6   for LTE focused primarily, as you would expect, on

7   commercial applications and use. There's nobody

8   looking about how this new technology is going to work

9   and apply for public safety's specific needs and

10 requirements.

11   So what the Public Safety Communications

12 Research Program is going to do in Boulder, and it's

13 actually going to be announced tonight in a published

14 Federal Register Notice that comes out tonight, is

15 that we are proposing the development of a

16 demonstration network in Boulder Colorado using our

17 Table Mountain radio free quiet zone to work with any

18 interested manufacturer or vendor or industry

19 participant to put together a demonstration LTE

20 network and actually look at it from the perspective

21 of public safety's specific requirements and

22 applications so that public safety can understand

23 exactly how this new cutting edge technology is going

24 to work for their specific purposes.

25   We don't want to recreate anything that's

1   going on in commercial tests, we want to have this be

2   focused specifically on public safety applications and

3   services. So issues, core issues, to public safety,

4   and one reason they looked at LTE, is priority access.

5   Well how is that going to work? And let's run through

6   some public safety scenarios and see how this works so

7   public safety is well grounded when this stuff is

8   deployed in their jurisdictions and have level set

9   expectations of what they're going to get from this

10   technology. That's the whole purpose of the

11   demonstration project.

12   We're looking for open research, we want the

13   outcome to be open to all, we want this to help and be

14   beneficial to the ERIC. As obviously a consumer of

15   this information, we want to work closely with the

16   PSST, our public safety associations. We will be

17   utilizing as a core document the NPSTC public safety

18   broadband requirements document to drive what we're

19   going to look at from an application and services

20   perspective. So we really are looking for this to be

21   a very open research demonstration project.

22   So I appreciate the opportunity today to

23   give people a heads up on this so that you understand

24   what we're going to be doing out in Boulder, and we're

25   I'm sure going to be collaborating with a lot of

1   people in this room, or I hope to be. So look for the

2   Federal Register Notice tonight, and it'll announce

3   the first meeting and also announce how interested

4   industry participants can begin to contact us and

5   participate in the program. So thank you very much,

6   and I'm going to turn this back to Jennifer.

7   MS. MANNER: Thank you very much, Dereck.

8   And I'd like to also extend my welcome to all of you

9   for attending today. ERIC will not be successful

10   unless we have the input and the support of public

11   safety, our Federal partners, and industry, so we

12   really appreciate you being here today to share your

13   insights with us. I got the lucky job of moderating

14   this event, so I'm going to lay out the ground rules

15   for folks, and we are very much looking forward to

16   hearing what you have to say.

17   We've had eleven people preregister to make

18   remarks, so we're going to go in the order that

19   they've signed up for remarks, so I'll call each one

20   up individually. Deandra over here -- raise your

21   hand, Deandra -- is our timer. And just to make sure

22   we have enough time to get through everyone, Deandra

23   will be running the clock. We'd ask our speakers to

24   speak from the podium over there and to actually talk

25   directly into the microphone just so everyone can hear

1   what you're saying.

2   You'll have about three minutes to make your

3   remarks, and then our panel over here, which is really

4   made up of folks who have been integral to the

5   creation of ERIC, are here to respond, answer

6   questions, and talk to you a little further about

7   ERIC, and let me just run through who is at this

8   table. First we have Ziad Sleem from the FCC. Dereck

9   Orr you've already met from NIST. Jeff Goldthorp from

10   the FCC, Behzad Ghaffari from the FCC, David Furth

11   from the FCC, and Chris Essid from DHS, and of course

12   Jamie Barnett.

13   What I would also ask is that our speakers

14   when they stand up if they could please state their

15   name and identify themselves just so everyone knows

16   who they are. Following this, depending on our

17   timing, we may open the floor to questions, but it'll

18   really depend on how much time the discussion and the

19   presentations take. So with that, I'd like to call up

20   our first speaker, Harlin McEwan.

21   MR. MCEWAN: Thank you, Jennifer. I am

22   Chief Harlin McEwan, I am Chairman of the Public

23   Safety Spectrum Trust, and I'm also Chairman of the

24   Communications and Technology Committee of the

25   International Association of Chiefs of Police. I

1   speak today on behalf of the Public Safety Spectrum

2   Trust, the nationwide 700 MHZ public safety broadband

3   licensee. The PSST has long supported all efforts

4   that will lead to the expeditious deployment of a

5   nationwide, interoperable, wireless broadband network

6   for public safety.

7   The PSST has worked closely with all public

8   safety groups to establish a collaborative process and

9   a consensus position on these issues to better advance

10   our common goals. We welcome the opportunity to work

11   with the FCC on the ERIC proposal in order to enhance

12   these efforts to best meet public safety's critical

13   needs. The ERIC proposal does raise some difficult

14   questions and concerns, however, and which we hope do

15   not become impediments to public safety's urgent need

16   for the long awaited interoperable wireless broadband

17   network.

18   The PSST questions whether ERIC may be

19   taking on a broader mission than necessary. Given how

20   long we have waited, we fear any efforts that may

21   further complicate our goal of bringing robust and

22   reliable broadband services to the public safety

23   community. In addition, we question whether the

24   proposed ERIC framework may create some duplicative

25   activities and responsibilities that could

1   inadvertently hinder the development of wireless

2   broadband services that meet public safety's needs.

3   For example, do the new ERIC boards and

4   committees have missions that overlap substantially

5   with existing active organizations? Notably, we are

6   concerned that the proposed public safety advisory

7   board, which the FCC says will be broadly

8   representative of the public safety community, will be

9   drawing on the limited volunteer resources of the

10   PSST, the National Public Safety Telecommunications

11   Council, and the Safecom Executive Committee as an

12   example.

13   Do some of the proposed responsibilities for

14   ERIC duplicate efforts that have already been

15   addressed by public safety and industry members,

16   including interoperability frameworks, technical

17   standards, roaming and priority service? Such efforts

18   have already been submitted for the record. Does the

19   current proposal undo years of preparation and

20   essentially start from scratch? And finally, while

21   the PSST supports and encourages the FCC to work with

22   other Federal government agencies to expedite network

23   deployment, would additional layers of interagency

24   involvement create new challenges and impediments?

25   Would the proposed ERIC structure impose new

1   bureaucratic Federal requirements as each agency seeks

2   to play a role? Do DHS, NIST, and TIA, DOJ, and other

3   Federal agencies, with their own Federal spectrum

4   resources and needs, share the same sense of urgency

5   as the state and local public safety agencies in

6   deploying this network? The PSST appreciates the

7   opportunity to participate in this forum and hopes to

8   work closely with the FCC to address the questions

9   raised today. We need to do this right, but we need

10   to start down the path with a streamlined, efficient

11   operation, and as quickly as possible. Thank you.

12   MS. MANNER: Thank you. Do any of our

13   panelists here have anything, responses or comments?

14   MR. MCEWAN: Am I supposed to stay up there?

15   MS. MANNER: It's up to you, it's

16   discretionary.

17   MR. FURTH: We're not going to deprive you

18   of the podium, Harlin.

19   (Laughter.)

20   MR. FURTH: Maybe I can just lead off. And

21   again, I'm David Furth, Deputy Chief in the Public

22   Safety Bureau. And Harlin I think raises a number of

23   extremely good questions, which are questions that we

24   have been asking and talking to public safety and

25   others about, and in fact that's one of the reasons

1   that we're having this forum is to come up with the

2   right answers to precisely the questions that Harlin

3   has asked, because we want to avoid duplication, we

4   don't want to create an unnecessary layer of

5   bureaucracy.

6   We are looking for a way to put ERIC into

7   the role that we see as essential with respect to

8   creating and fostering and continuing to foster an

9   environment that will support interoperability, but

10   leveraging existing resources, the resources that the

11   public safety licensee brings to bear, that the public

12   safety community brings to bear, that industry,

13   standards setting bodies bring to bear.

14   All of those, our Federal partners, I think

15   as the statements that have been made here have

16   underscored, we're looking to take advantage of all of

17   those, so that what ERIC can provide is a framework,

18   and that is really what ERIC is intended to provide is

19   a framework, both to create it and then to maintain it

20   over time because we're talking about a technological

21   environment when we're talking about broadband that is

22   not static, it's anything but static, and so we need

23   to have a framework that can evolve as technology

24   evolves.

25   And I think that Harlin has asked good

1   questions about exactly how we should structure the

2   advisory committees. We certainly see that public

3   safety needs to play a critical advisory role, and we

4   don't want to duplicate existing effort or create

5   additional burdens on already strained public safety

6   resources. So one of the things that we're interested

7   in from this forum as well as from dialogue that we've

8   had is in figuring out the best way to accomplish just

9   that. With that, if others on the panel have

10   comments?

11   MS. MANNER: Jeff please.

12   MR. GOLDTHORP: Yeah, I just wanted to

13   comment on one specific aspect of what you said,

14   Harlin, because I also thought you were right on

15   target in this area as well, and that is, I think one

16   of the hardest technical challenges that ERIC faces is

17   deciding -- to strike the right balance between a set

18   of requirements that are at once detailed enough to

19   enable interoperability, to establish the right

20   framework for interoperability, without being so

21   detailed that they somehow unnecessarily inhibit the,

22   you know, local control and how, you know, folks want

23   to do things within their own jurisdiction, it's that

24   are things that are fine to do that have nothing to do

25   with interoperability.

1   So the challenge, one of the challenges, the

2   technical challenge for ERIC is to strike that

3   balance. It's been done before. And the analogy that

4   I'm thinking of, that I promised Jennifer I wouldn't

5   use, but I'm going to do it anyway because I think it

6   really is a good analogy, and that is it's been done

7   and it's been done with the Internet. And the thing

8   that makes the Internet beautiful is the simplicity of

9   the protocols.

10   The TCP/IP protocols are elegant in their

11   simplicity. They allow operators of autonomous

12   systems to do whatever they want in their networks,

13   carriers that are operating autonomous systems that

14   connect to the Internet, can do whatever, they can

15   move traffic around using whatever protocol they want,

16   as long as they're communicating with their peers

17   using standard Internet IETF protocols. Well it's the

18   same model here, and the challenge is not to burden

19   the requirements with too much complexity and more

20   than is necessary. Less is better here.

21   MS. MANNER: Thank you. Unless -- I can

22   give you a minute, Harlin, but we need to move on.

23   MR. MCEWAN: I just want to thank you. I

24   appreciate your response, and I believe that's exactly

25   the tone of what I'm trying to say is that we've all